DEPARTMENT OF BENEFIT PAYMENTS

744 P Street Sacramento, CA 95814 August 7, 1974



ALL-COUNTY LETTER NO. 74-158

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: Camp v. Swoap

REFERENCE:

By letter dated March 1, 1972, you were advised of the Modified Preliminary Injunction issued by the Sacramento County Superior Court in the case of Camp v. Carleson. At that time you were provided copies of regulations regarding stepfather contributions which had been adopted pursuant to the Preliminary Injunction in Camp. On July 19, 1974, the Superior Court issued a Permanent Injunction which does not require any change in current procedure for the determination of stepfather contributions. Current regulations governing those contributions will remain in effect.

However, the Permanent Injunction also invalidates the provision in EAS § 44-133.54 requiring mandatory referral of stepfather cases to the appropriate county legal officer. You should continue to determine whether a stepfather makes available to the wife or Family Budget Unit an appropriate amount in accordance with EAS § 44-133.53. If a stepfather is not making such appropriate amount available, the case shall be referred for legal action only where one or more of the following conditions are met:

- 1. The wife expresses a freely given willingness to institute proceedings pursuant to Civil Code § 5127.5 to obtain her share of the community property.
- There are additional reasonable grounds to suspect that the stepfather and his wife or either of them have violated W&I Code §§ 11482 or 11483 by having intentionally concealed or misstated income, which

ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS Page Two August 7, 1974

the stepfather actually provides his non-adopted stepchildren, with the intention in making such false statement or concealing such fact to obtain aid for the said children.

3. There are additional reasonable grounds to believe that the stepfather, having the ability to do so, does not actually provide his wife with necessary food, clothing, shelter and medical attention as required by Penal Code § 270a.

You should continue to refer all stepfather cases which meet one or more of the above conditions to the appropriate county legal officer in accordance with EAS § 44-133.54. Amendments to EAS § 44-133.54 which reflect the requirements of the Permanent Injunction are currently being prepared. The amended regulation will be issued shortly. You are directed to comply with the Permanent Injunction, a copy of which is attached. The trial court's decision in the Camp case is now final and will be appealed by the State.

Sincerely,

JEROLD A. PROD

Chief Deputy Director

Attachment

cc: CWDA

STEETSED

JHL 1 9 1974

W. M. BOREST COOKEY CLOSE, BY J. T. COMOCIA. DEFOLY No.
The an investigation on the in my of the official on the in my office.

Attest:
Certified
W. N. Durtes: County Cloric and su-officio Ciera of the studentor Court in and for the Leither of Steremento State of Caldornia.

By

SUPERIOR COURT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

ROSIE LEE CAMP, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

DAVID B. SWOAP, Director,
Department of Benefit Payments,)
State of California; DEPARTMENT)
OF BENEFIT PAYMENTS, a Depart-)
ment of the State of California)
formerly STATE DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL WELFARE,

Defendants.

No. 216154

PERMANENT INJUNCTION

The above-entitled action came on regularly for trial on February 4, 1974, at 10:00 a.m., before the Court without a jury, the Honorable B. ABBOTT GOLDBERG, Judge, presiding. JAY-ALLEN EISEN and CRAIG H. SCOTT appeared as attorneys for plaintiffs. RICHARD M. SKINNER, Deputy Attorney General, appeared as attorney for defendants. The Court heard the testimony, examined the proofs and carefully considered the written and oral arguments

offered by the parties. The Court having filed its findings of fact and conclusions of law on June 18, 1974, and entered its judgment herein on June 20, 1974, at Book 322, Page 154,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants, their successors in office, agents, assigns, employees and all persons acting by, through, in concert with, or under them or subject to their supervision and control are permanently restrained and enjoined from:

- 1. Adopting or enforcing the provisions of

 E.A.S. §§44-113.6 and 44-133.5 as effective October 1, 1971, or

 any similar regulations which consider a wife's community pro
 perty interest in or any other portion of her husband's income to

 be available for the support of the wife's children by another

 man whom the husband has not adopted in determining the child
 ren's eligibility for and amount of AFDC, in the absence of

 proof that such income is actually available to her children to

 meet their needs, or to the wife for use to support her children;
- 2. Enforcing the provisions of E.A.S. §44-315.431 as adopted June 29, 1972, or any other regulation which computes grants to AFDC children living with non-adoptive stepfathers in that a manner different than/required by Welfare & Institutions Code \$11450(a), or limits the maximum grants payable to such children to amounts less than those set forth in the table contained in Welfare & Institutions Code §11450(a) as modified by the cost-of-living adjustments required by Welfare & Institutions Code §11453, or treats such children in a manner different from

- 3. Enforcing the provisions of E.A.S. §44-133.54 or any similar regulation which requires mandatory referral for legal action of all cases in which a stepfather does not make actually available to his wife her full community property interest in his earnings except in those particular cases where:
 - (a) the wife expresses a freely-given willingness to institute proceedings to obtain such community property share pursuant to Civil Code §5127.5;
 - (b) there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the stepfather and his wife or either of them have violated Welfare & Institutions Code §\$11482 or 11483 by having intentionally concealed or misstated income which the stepfather actually provides his wife's children by another man with the intention in making such false statement or concealing such fact to obtain aid for the said children; or
 - (c) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the stepfather, having the ability to do so, does not actually provide his wife with necessary food, clothing, shelter and medical attention as required by Penal Code §270a.

DATED: July 19, 1974

LASBOTT GRIDERING

B. ABBOTT GOLDBERG

Judge of the Superior Court